

Remarks

Claims 1-80 are pending and rejected. Claims 1-80 are cancelled and claims 81-100 are added by this amendment. Applicants assert that new claims 81-100 are fully supported by the specification and do not contain new matter. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 81-100.

The references cited on pages 12 and 45 of the specification have been cited in the enclosed IDS.

Claims 1-80 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 1-80 have been cancelled and new claims 81-100 have been drafted to avoid a similar double patenting rejection.

Claims 14, 17, 20, 32, 48, 51, 54, 70, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. Claims 1-80 have been cancelled and new claims 81-100 have been drafted to avoid a similar indefiniteness rejection.

Claims 1-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,314,103 (Medhat). Claims 1-80 have been cancelled and new claims 81-100 have been drafted to avoid a similar rejection over Medhat. In particular, Medhat does not disclose a signaling processor that processes signaling for a call to select a connection, a bandwidth rate, *an encoding scheme, and a billing rate*.

Claims 1-21, 27-31, 33-55, and 61-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,315,586 (Charvillar). Claims 1-80 have been cancelled and new claims 81-100 have been drafted to avoid a similar rejection over Charvillar. In particular, Charvillar does not disclose a signaling processor that processes signaling for a call to select a connection, a bandwidth rate, *an encoding scheme, and a billing rate*.

Claims 22-26 and 56-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Charvillar in view of U.S. Patent 5,065,393 (Sibbitt). Claims 1-80 have been cancelled and new claims 81-100 have been drafted to avoid a similar rejection over Charvillar in view of Sibbitt. In particular, Charvillar and Sibbitt do not disclose a signaling processor that processes signaling for a call to select a connection, a bandwidth rate, *an encoding scheme, and a billing rate*.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 81-100.



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Michael J. Setter, Reg. No. 37,936
Faegre & Benson, LLP
Telephone: (303) 546-1300
Facsimile: (303) 449-5416

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100